



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—*Charleston Provincialisms.*

BY SYLVESTER PRIMER, Ph. D.,

PROFESSOR OF FRENCH AND GERMAN IN THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON, CHARLESTON, S. C.

In every large city we find peculiarities in the language and customs which serve in the aggregate to mark its distinctive and individual character. They strike the stranger upon his first contact with its people as archaisms or as innovations, at least as developments peculiar to the place itself. They are often, indeed, heirlooms which the founders of the city have left it, invaluable and sacred, whose historic worth is incomparable to the philologist and historian. Often a single expression, or even sound, or a peculiar custom, conveys an historic truth more forcibly to the attentive observer than long chapters of dry history. For words, sounds, customs, also have their history, and a word has often been called an epic poem. Moreover, these peculiarities set their seal, as it were, upon each of its citizens, identifying him with itself, and whatever distinction he may acquire, either at home or abroad, is reflected upon his native place. They carry us back, historically, to the fatherland of those pioneers who founded the city and peopled the adjacent country. They still preserve the kindred relations to the mother-country, even after those of a political nature have been severed. We may see this in those colonies of Greece which have left their impress upon the country colonized, observable after everything Greek had passed away. (cf. Lower Italy, Marseille in France, and Louisiana in this country).

One might gather invaluable information bearing upon the history of a city simply by collecting and collating its stock of old and new words, and noting the change in its customs from decade to decade. It is not in the scope of this article, however, to attempt such a thorough investigation as that would imply. I shall confine myself to the more marked peculiarities in the pronunciation, tracing it back to the age when the first settlers came over from England. Many sounds still current in the daily speech of the Charlestonians, especially the pronunciation of certain vowels and words, were brought from England

with the first colony in 1670. It is just after the close of the great Elisabethan period, Elisabeth having died in 1603. Therefore the language of the latter part of the sixteenth century and the whole of the seventeenth century must form the basis of our comparison. In other words the grammar and pronunciation of Shakespeare will form the nearest approximation to that of England at this time.

We are, however, confronted with a serious difficulty at the very outset, and one which every investigation of this kind involves. For "at any one instant of time," says ELLIS (E. E. P., p. 18), "there are generally three generations living. Each middle generation has commenced at a different time, and has modified the speech of its preceding generation in a somewhat different manner, after which it retains the modified form, while the subsequent generation proceeds to change that form once more. Consequently there will not be any approach to uniformity of speech sounds in any one place at any one time, but there will be a kind of mean, the general utterance of the more thoughtful or more respected persons of mature age, round which the other sounds seem to hover, and which, like the averages of the mathematicians, not agreeing precisely with any, may for the purpose of science be assumed to represent all, and be called the language of the district assigned." An additional difficulty presents itself in the great and almost unprecedented change that has swept over the South since the late war, modifying not only the customs and habits of its people but changing likewise the whole tenor of their lives. The influence upon its language and literature, upon educational interests in general, has been exceedingly great and the final result cannot yet be foretold. During the last twenty years the conservatism of the Old South has been gradually retiring before the new and more progressive spirit and the pronunciation has undergone a more rapid change than ever before in its history. And the end is not yet. At the present day we are in a transitional stage of more than ordinary import, since the constant phonetic laws of change, ever in operation under all circumstances, have been accelerated. In our comparisons it will, therefore, be necessary to remember these facts and to make due allowance for the old and the new, for conservatism and progress. Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that there is a great and fundamental difference between the American and English pronunciation. "The diver-

gency of American and English phonetic practice," says BELL in 'Essays and Postscripts on Elocution,' p. 14, "seems to be less a modern departure on this side of the Atlantic, than a survival of early English characteristics; just as many words which have been classed as Americanisms, are, in reality, old English terms which had dropped out of use in their native land." Similarities may, therefore, be misleading and it will be well to be on our guard against them. Bearing these precautions in mind we may safely venture an average comparison of the pronunciation in different sections of the country.

A stranger in conversation with a Charlestonian first observes a slight shade of difference in the pronunciation of certain vowels and words. Peculiarities of this kind are naturally more marked among the middle and lower classes, though the prevailing sound which a given letter may have acquired in any place pervades to a certain extent all classes of society. This is especially true of Charleston, which, from its very foundation to the present day, has ever been conservative; it has also been seclusive in the sense that it has never had a large floating population of mixed nationality like so many of our American cities. Hence the facility with which it has preserved certain vowel sounds and grammatical phrases that have changed in other places with the influx of new influences, the rapid progress of commercial and inland intercourse, and the varying population. Another important element tending to the preservation of older, or provincial, English pronunciations and phrases is to be sought in the fact that the South has ever been conservative in its literature and education. The good old English authors of the days of their forefathers have ever been their favorite reading, the earlier period having mostly the preference. Few books but well read has been their motto. In their education they have been just as conservative. They have not advanced with the rapid strides of the North and West, nor has the American features of our present educational system received so great encouragement at the South as in the more progressive sections. The South has added almost nothing to its development. In antebellum times the sons, and often the daughters, received the principal part of their education abroad, in England, France, or Germany, or in all of these countries. As a consequence their education has never been thoroughly American; they have never thoroughly identi-

fied themselves with the American idea, have been but little influenced by American literature, have lived more under the influence of English ideas than the people of the North and West; naturally enough the England they left when they came here. For they were too far from the mother country to feel the pulse that has been advancing England and have only seen and felt its faintest glimmer. Not that the South has not produced any writers or poets. She has always had her representatives in the field of literature, but they have ever been of the English school, or else peculiarly southern, never purely American in the broad sense of the word. One good result has followed. They have hitherto not been flooded with vicious cheap literature to such an extent as the North and West. For the cheap literatures of England and Europe did not stray so far, only the standard authors being imported; that of the North did not find its way to the South. Hence the tone of the reading public has been higher, though the proportional number of readers has been comparatively less. Reading has never penetrated so far downward into the lower strata of society as in England and in the North. Unfortunately the South has been precipitated into the whirl and bustle of progressive America and the taste of her youth is becoming vitiated by the floods of cheap books which have in a measure acquired a monopoly throughout the whole country in the reading world of the middle and lower classes. Conservatism is consequently passing away to give place to the new order of things, and through her greater contact with the outer world Charleston is gradually losing her older pronunciation and archaic forms and expressions. The pronunciation of the vowels as taught in the schools is gradually superseding that of the fathers and mothers, and in a few decades the latter will have entirely passed away. How much of its old conservatism the New South will throw off is a question of the future.

As "the essence of every living language lies in its sounds, not in its letters," which in England have not followed the many changes the sounds themselves have undergone in their development from the earliest period to recent times, it will be advisable to begin the investigation with those sounds of the spoken Charlestonian English peculiar to itself, and then institute our comparisons and trace the sound back, historically, to its origin. This will lead us through the eighteenth, seventeenth,

and even as far as the sixteenth century in England, to which period the similar and divergent sounds of the North and West are also traceable, when not native growths.

Since phoneticians have not yet adopted a uniform set of signs for the different sounds of the alphabet, I shall use those employed by ELLIS, modified as the case may demand by those of SWEET, VIETOR, SIEVERS and other phoneticians, always giving authority.—In discussing the vowels it will be more in accordance with scientific principles to begin either with the palatals or gutturals rather than to proceed in the usual order from *a* to *u* or *i*, and then retrace our steps to *a* and pass to *i* or *u*. Since it makes but little difference whether *u* or *i* be treated first, I shall follow the order indicated by STORM, 'Eng. Philol.,' p. 64 (cf. also SIEVERS 'Phon.,' pp. 96–7) and treat them in the order *i e a o u*, considering in each case the intermediary sounds falling between the principal vowels. Then will follow the compound vowels and consonants.

The long *i*-sound, like that of long *o* and *u*, is accompanied by the vanish, as in the pronoun *he* (pr. *hiɪ'i*); but this sound; which the words *ear*, *here*, *hear*, commonly have elsewhere, has not entirely replaced the older pronunciation of (ee) in *there*: (dheer), SWEET's low-front-narrow, nearly like French *père*, *faire*. In the more common pronunciation the words *ear*, *air*, *tear* (= lacryma), and *tear* (= to rend), are not distinguishable. *Hear*, *care*, *fair*, etc., belong to this class and will be treated under (*e*). *Pierce* and the proper names *Peirce*, *Pierce*, *Pearce* (pr. piirs) always have the long *i*-sound and are never pronounced *pers*: (pers) as in New England. *Either* and *neither* fluctuate between (ii) and (ei) as elsewhere. In one word "tester" the long *i*-sound (tiistr) is the only pronunciation, whereas it always has the short sound of *e* in *met* elsewhere. In words from the Latin like *simultaneous*, etc; the *i* is more generally pronounced (ii), rarely (*i*), the more ordinary pronunciation in the rest of the country and in England. It would seem to be the pronunciation of the educated.

The long *e* is equivalent to (*ee'*), but the shades of sound between *e* and *a* differ slightly from those of the North and West, often approaching nearer those in vogue in England. Such words as *care*, *there*, *Mary*, which usually have the sound of *a* in *at*, *cat*, *pat*, (æ) hence *kæɪ*, *dhæɪ*, *mæɪri* are pronounced *keɪ*, *dheɪ*, *meɪri* etc. Here belong *e'er*, *ne'er*, *ere*, *there*, *where*,

bear, pear, tear (lacryma), *tear* (to rend), *swear, wear, fair, hair, hear here, their, scarce, mare, pair, prayer, stair, chair, spear, despair, gear, dear, deer, appear*, and others. This pronunciation also prevails in England, though the other is possibly more frequent. My personal observation fails in this respect, so that I am obliged to draw my inference from the remarks of ELLIS and SWEET. Nor is it at all peculiar to the South; it appears as an individualism in different parts of the country, especially with older people. The schools and the inexorable law of a "standard pronunciation" are rapidly suppressing this relic of an earlier age and one must observe the older people or the less cultured to hear it spoken most perfectly. Still even the most cultured people often use it, and I have also heard it from the platform and pulpit. It is very ancient, going back to CHAUCER and the earlier period of the language (cf. ELLIS, E. E. P., p. 262) where the spelling was mostly *ee*, occasionally *ea*. The latter spelling *ea* was introduced in the sixteenth century to indicate the pronunciation, just as *oa* in words like *boar*. "It was not till after the middle of the sixteenth century that anything like a rule appeared, and then *ee* was used for (ii), and *ea* for (ee)." (ELLIS, E. E. P., p. 78). "The introduction of *ee*, *ea*, was therefore a phonetic device intended, to assist the readers." *ibid.* p. 76. "The *o* which became (uu) was written *oo*, and the *o* which remained unchanged became *oa*." It is SWEET's low-front-narrow and has been especially treated by PROFESSOR TEN BRINK in the *Anglia* I, p. 526 ff., with special reference to CHAUCER. As near as can be determined at this late date, the sound of the present Charlestonian pronunciation in these words is identical with that of the earlier period of CHAUCER, and it can be traced through all succeeding periods of the language. I do not know as it is "exceedingly interesting, now, to find in CHAUCER *hair* written generally *heer* or *here*," as PROFESSOR SMITH, in the *Southern Bivouac* for November, 1885, considers it. For English spelling, especially in the present state, could show many very striking examples, not only of interest but of wonder, whether considered scientifically, historically, or practically. At that time they tried to reflect the pronunciation in the spelling, and were at least consistent, though often failing in their attempt. It is, however, a matter of interest to be able to trace back a peculiar pronunciation to a remote period and observe that it has actually maintained itself over five hundred

years through all the vicissitudes of time and place and still remains as a monument of antiquity in the spoken language of to-day. Especially is this true in a language which has undergone such violent and frequent changes (phonetic) as the English during that long period. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries we find the same pronunciation of many of these words, though other pronunciations were also current. Thus in the seventeenth century we have (dhæɪ) (for both *there* and *their*) as well as (dheɪ), etc.; likewise tæɪ, tshæɪ (for *tear*, *chair*) in the eighteenth century, and also mæɪ, dhæɪ, etc. But tiir, tshiir (a pronunciation often heard at the present day) were not uncommon then. When PROFESSOR C. F. SMITH (l. c.) says, however, that the pronunciation (neeɪ) etc., instead of niir, etc., "may be due to the principle in philology that the Germans call *Lässigkeit* (carelessness, laziness)," and that "it requires, for example, more effort to say (niir) than (neer), and this pronunciation may be, in effect, the result of the same influence which makes the typical Southerner speak more slowly and drawl more than the Yankee," he errs in point of fact and history. How would that explain the (neeɪ) etc., of CHAUCER, which PROFESSOR SMITH cites as being the same as the modern Charlestonian? CHAUCER certainly had nothing of the typical Southerner in him. Nor did the later Britons who pronounced these words niir, etc., have any characteristics of the Yankee. Moreover, MAX MÜLLER has long ago assumed that phonetic change is due to the very *Lässigkeit* of which PROFESSOR SMITH speaks, and here we have the more difficult (according to PROFESSOR SMITH) following the more easy. Finally it requires no more effort to say (niir) than (neeɪ), as every one can convince himself by trial. The real explanation lies in a different phonetic principle. A reference to ELLIS, E. E. P., p. 89 ff. would have given PROFESSOR SMITH a clearer idea of the process of the change from (ee) to (ii), a change more far-reaching in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries than now. Even at the present day we often hear very old people speak of a (tshiir) and (obliidzh); the very common pronunciation of (diif) for (deef) is too well known to need mention here. We find the same change in the modern Greek and in the passage of the Latin to the modern Romance languages. ELLIS considers it due to "a remarkable tendency to thinness of sound owing to a predilection for the higher lingual or palatal vowels" (p. 89). "In the

sixteenth century the spelling *ee* was introduced for those words in which the sound has actually altered to (ii), (ibid. 227), and the tendency since has been from *ee* to *ü*." These are only monuments of the early pronunciation retained at the present day. The words *again*, *against*, which have as a rule the pronunciation (agEn, agEnst) in the North and West are almost always pronounced (ageen, ageenst) in Charleston, a pronunciation which reaches back as far as the seventeenth century. The Latin prefix *pre-* generally has here the sound (ii) in words like *predecessor*, etc., (prli-di-sessɪ), though (pred-i-sessɪ) is not uncommon. I mention here merely as an individualism a word which I have heard pronounced in a few instances in a peculiar manner; it is the word *very*, which sounds, as near as I can determine, like (vzi) (SWEET's low-mixed-narrow, p. 27).

Speaking in general terms and not with that strict accuracy which a phonetician might demand, the *a*-sound stands between the palatal and guttural vowels, shading off towards *e* and *i* on the one hand and towards *o* and *u* on the other. The difference of sound observed in different localities result from the different shade or color adopted as the standard in any particular place. The pure *a*-sound, as in *father*, or its Italian sound, is rare in Charleston; the tendency is rather to the *æ*-sound, as in *man*, *cat*, *sad*. Thus *pa*, *ma* are pronounced (pæ, mæ,) and not (pA, mA,) the more common pronunciation. Before the mute *l* followed by *m* we have the long (ææ), as in *bath*. Thus *calm*, *palm*, *psalm*, are pronounced (kææm, pææm, sææm). This sound is frequently accompanied by the vanish (æææ). We also have the same sound for *a* and *au* when they precede *f* (*ff*, *gh*), *ft*, *n*, *nd*, *th*, *s* (*ss*) and *s* tenuis; *ask*, *demand*, *ant* and *aunt*, *glance*, *bath*, *laugh*, *example*, *launch*, *grant*, *command*, *dance*, *past*, *gaunt*, *jaunt*, etc., all of which have the sound (ææ) and never (aa), thus, (ææsk, di-mæænd), etc., and never (aask, di-maand, etc). The short *æ*-sound reaches back to the early part of the seventeenth century and long (ææ) to the middle of the same, but we also have (aa) in *bath*, *ask*, *grant*, as at present; this may have been the more common pronunciation. Words in *-alm* were pronounced AAm (awn) in the seventeenth century and are now divided between (aam) and (ææm). What PROFESSOR SMITH really means by the writing *călm*, *psălm*, is difficult to say; for the vowel *a* is here long and not short; nor is the circumflex the phonetic sign of any sound whatever; it usually in-

dicates mere shortness. The contest still going on in such words as *gaunt*, *haunt*, *jaunt*, *daunt*, etc., began in the early part, or middle, of the sixteenth century. The earlier pronunciation of (au), as in the German *Haus*, hence (gaunt), probably changed to (aa) or (aa), and then passed entirely to (AA), as in *awn*. In America we still retain the two latter: (gaant), in N. Y., and (gAAnt) in various parts of the country, and have also added the thinner pronunciation of (gæant); the latter is very common and seems to be gaining ground (cf. ELLIS, E. E. P., pp. 146, 148). Some shorten the sound to (gænt). The sound (gAAnt) seems to have been the favorite in the seventeenth century and divides the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with gæant.

In discussing the *a*-sounds we pass almost imperceptibly from the palatal to the guttural vowels, of which we have already noticed those belonging more particularly to *a* proper. The three usual sounds of *o*, two of which are long as in *no*, *more*, and one short as in *not*, provided this ought not rather to be classed with the guttural sounds of *a*, are found here. The *o* in *not* probably stands on the boundary line between guttural *a* and *o*. Like the other long vowels when not followed by a second vowel, the long *o*-sounds are accompanied by the vanish, though in very rare instances the continental pure *a* is heard. It is my impression that we in America generally pronounce the *o* in *no* and *more* exactly alike, or begin them alike and the glide on the *r* alone makes a slight difference towards the end of the sound, while in England, and individually in Charleston also, possibly in other places, it frequently has the sound of *a* in *all*, *war*, of *au* in *law* (cf. VIETOR, p. 35, ELLIS, l. c.). I have often heard this sound in Charleston in such words as *more*, *ore*, etc., (mAAɪ, AAɪ). This sound is nearly like that in the word *morning* (mAAɪnɪq) and not at all like that in *mourning* (moornɪnɪq), between which ELLIS and SWEET appear to make no difference. This sound *o* is, however, never heard in *home*, *stone*, etc., as is often the case in other parts of the country. The two words *dog* and *God* always have the sound AA; as, dAAg, gAAɔ. We still distinguish between *borne* (boorn) and *born* (bAArn), *mourning* (moornɪnɪq) and *morning* (mAAɪnɪq), showing more conservatism than England, as this distinction reaches back to the seventeenth century (cf. STORM, *ibid.*, p. 93). The word *poor* sometimes receives the sound (pooɪ) instead of (puuɪ). The disappearance of the *r* after *o*, and under all

circumstances, is not so prevalent in this country as in England, so that we still make a distinction between *lord* (lAɪd) and *laud* (lAd). Cf. ELLIS and VIETOR, *ibid.* The omission of *r* in *more* (moɔɪ), *door* (doɔɪ), etc., will be mentioned under the letter *r*. The Latin prefix (*pro-*) retains the long sound of *o* (oo) with most people, as *programme*, *progress*, *process* (proo-), rarely (proɔges, proɔses), like *o* in *on*, *odd*. Modern English has developed a tendency to lengthen the short radical vowel before the letters *r*, *l*, and the combinations *ld*, *mb*, *nd*, *ng*, a tendency which can be traced back to CHAUCER. The words *pond*, *bond* are generally counted among the exceptions to this law, but here they are pronounced for the most part (pAAnd). The preposition *to* is almost invariably pronounced *too* exactly as in the time of CHAUCER.

In English we have a less rounded (labialized, or, as SWEET with more justice calls it, absence of lip-pouting, or non-projection of the lips), more open *u* than the continental; the close *u* appears rather as an individualism with us. The pure *u*-sound as in *too*, *rule* (with a slight vanish of course) offers no variety, except that the pure short *u*-sound is retained in words like *natural*, *literature*, etc., but we shall consider the omission of the *i*-palatal sound after *t* under dentals. That shade of the *u*-sound heard in *put*, *book*, *pull*, *pudding*, etc., has passed entirely over to its sound in *but*, hence the good majority of Charlestonians pronounce these words pɛt, bɛk, pɛl, pɛdiŋ, or is it, perhaps, the close Scotch *u* in *come up*, SWEET's low-back-narrow? Not having accurately observed the Scotch sound I am unable to decide. ELLIS mentions the co-existence of the two sounds in many words, as tu pɛt, bɛtshlɪ. The first (tu pɛt) is very common here, but the second (bɛtshlɪ) seems more an individualism (ELLIS p. 175). The same remark applies to WALKER's list of words given by ELLIS, p. 175. Some have one sound, some the other, but all may have the ɛ-sound with individual people. According to ELLIS the south of England has (ɛ), while the north retains the older *u*-sound of the seventeenth century. The ɛ-sound is a later development. I have never noticed wɛd for *would*, nor wɛmɛn for *woman*, but should not be surprised to hear it in individual cases. It is a pronunciation often heard in England and I have heard it frequently with older people in Western New York and elsewhere. SHERIDAN gives a list of what he calls Irishisms,

among which this sound takes a prominent place, and we recognize many of the Charlestonianisms just mentioned (bēl, bēsh, pēsh, pēl, pēlpīt, pēdīn, kēshən, fēt, pēt, drēv, strēv), all of which are relics of this seventeenth century pronunciation, adopted by the Irish when they accepted the English tongue. This sound is still heard in England and in various parts of America (generally with older people) and shows the tenacity with which certain sounds perpetuate themselves. The same may be said of all the peculiarities noticed. They date back without exception to the old country, and are not a new phonetic development in this country.

The compound vowels offer but few peculiarities. The digraph *ei* has the simple sound in the word *leisure* which has the two pronunciations (lezhı) and (liizhı), the latter being the more general. The *oi* in words like *boil*, *toil*, *oil*, often has among the lower classes the vulgar pronunciation of (bāil), etc., which then passes wholly over to (bāil); for I consider the first element of the compound rather an *a* (cf. VIETOR, *ibid.*, p. 57) than the *u* in *but*, which ELLIS prefers. The employment of the *u*-sound in *but* in this diphthong would seem affected in America. It is only mentioned here because the long *i* in *mine* in rare individual cases has the former sound (moin). The first element appears to be the *o* in *not* and the second the *i* in *river*; for it passes from the vulgar pronunciation of *b il*, *lāil*, *āil*, to the correct one *boil*. The French *beauté* has given us *beauty*, written earlier *bewte* (beuti). The modern French pronunciation has not reacted upon this word, though it has upon a compound from the same root (beaufort) adopted into English. The North Carolina town Beaufort reflects the modern French pronunciation (boofort), while the South Carolina town of the same name reflects the sixteenth century pronunciation of these words (beufort). I have not observed (sheu and seu) for show and sow, though they exist in Western New York.

The consonants do not offer many variations from the normal pronunciation in other parts of the country, but a few peculiarities call for our attention. We will begin with the *y* and *w* which are nearest the vowels, to whichever class they may finally be placed. MR. BRISTED in his 'Notes on American Pronunciation,' quoted by ELLIS, p. 1220, says: "The inhabitants of Charleston, and all the Southern and South-Eastern part of the State, pronounce initial *w* (whether at the beginning

of a word or syllable) like *v*. Like *v* to me; perhaps you would call it *bh* or German *w* (which I own myself unable to distinguish from *v*). This peculiarity is common to all classes, except those of the upper class who have lived in Europe or at the North; they are not aware of it. I cannot find any European origin for it. It is supposed to come from the negroes." ELLIS also quotes from a letter of PROF. MARCH: "A large part of the people of this region (Easton, Pennsylvania, U. S.), which was settled by Germans, do not use the teeth for English *v*, or make with *w* the usual English sonancy, and they are said, therefore, to exchange *w* and *v*. I dare say the facts are the same at Charleston, South Carolina, of which MR. BRISTED speaks. I have heard it said that the South Carolina change was started by German market gardeners about Charleston, but one would think that there must have been some general tendency to this *lautverschiebung*, or it could hardly have gained currency, as it has, among the proudest and precisest of colonial literary aristocracies." The fact of the matter is that the above statement rests upon a misunderstanding. The exchange spoken of is entirely unknown here. I have never heard it myself, nor have any of my colleagues or friends, and some of them are native Charlestonians of over seventy-five, with excellent hearing and remarkable powers of observation; such an abnormal sound as that would never have escaped them. In my German classes the students of German descent are inclined to pronounce the German *w* (*bh*) like the English, a fault which it is impossible to correct. The native Charlestonians, however, never make that mistake, but always pronounce it like our *v*. There is a large German and Dutch element here who speak a passably good English, who may exchange the two sounds under discussion, and this may have led to the mistake. I have never heard it, if they do. The opposite exchange of *w* for *v* is occasionally heard among the lower classes, and more rarely even among the higher. Thus we hear people speak of their *vocation*, of being *prowoked*, etc. In the combination *wh* the *h* is always silent. *When, where*, etc., are pronounced (*wen weer*).

The American *r* certainly has a more distinct sound than ELLIS (E. E. P., p. 196; cf. also SWEET, Handb. of Phonet., p. 186, STORM, Engl. Philol., p. 84, 105-106) seems to admit for England, although far different from the continental *r*, and

perhaps heard more in its effect upon the surrounding vowels than in any distinct sound of its own. But the practiced ear will always detect the distinct *r*-sound in such words as *farther*, *lord*, *arms*, *burn curb*, *hurt*, *lurk*, as compared with *father*, *laud alms*, *bun*, *cub*, *hut*, *luck*, which are by several phoneticians said to be identical in quality though differing in quantity. BELL in his 'University Lectures' (1887, p. 52) makes the following excellent distinction between the English and the American *r*: "The English *r* is abrupt and purely lingual; while the American *r* is comparatively long, as well as labialised." TRAUTMANN in his book on 'Die Sprachlaute' distinguishes three grades of the *r* under discussion: a) in accented syllables like *fur*, *work*, *scourge*, etc., where the *r* is long; b) in unaccented syllables where the *r* is half long, or short, or sometimes under-short, and has only the *r*-sound without the addition of a silent vowel, as *fibre*, *acre*, *mere*, *care*, *beer*, *tear*, *fair*, etc.; c) the *r*-sound is very fleeting, leaning towards open French *o* in *encore* when a voiceless consonant follows, as *sort*, *pork*, *course*, but is more distinct when a voiced consonant follows as *lord*, *board*, *form*, etc. When the vowel *a* precedes, it is, however, almost inaudible, as in *hard*, *harsh*, *harp*, etc. But never in any of these cases does the *r*-sound, according to TRAUTMANN, entirely disappear, except in the pronunciation of the lower classes. These remarks apply in general to the pronunciation of the *r* in Charleston where there is always a perceptible *r*-sound. The final *r* differs in some cases from that in the North and West, and in England. I have never observed *adventr*, *djunkttr*, *lektr*, *neetr*, *pastr*, *piktr*, *skripttr*, *ledjisleetr*, *senotr*, *eeprn*, so often heard in other parts of the country, i. e. the pure *r*-sound after the dental instead of *tjur* or *tshjɹ* as in the standard pronunciation. This sound may, and probably does, exist here. The vulgar pronunciation of *windr*, *sindr* (window, cinder) is frequent enough, as is the case with all the other peculiarities in the pronunciation of *r* mentioned by ELLIS, *ibid.*, p. 201. We have already touched upon the disappearance of *r*-final in words like *more*, *door* (pr. *moov*, *doov*), etc. It is a negligence similar to that of the dropping of *g* in the termination *-ing*, also very common here, less so at the North and West. In the case of *r* the vanish often disappears also and only *moo*, *doo* is heard.

In passing to the dental series we observe first of all that the common terminations *tjur*, *tjr*, *tshr* are not especial favorites in

Charleston. They are of course frequently met with in words like *neetshur*, *neetshr*, but are avoided in *natshurvl* or *natshrvl* *litrotshur*, *ledjisleetshr*, etc., which are here pronounced *naturvvl* *litrotur*, *ledjishleetur*, etc., or sometimes even *natjurvl*, etc. This is the dividing line of the seventeenth century and the pronunciation has been retained here.

The opposite tendency manifests itself in the guttural series where the similar change resulting from the introduction of an *i*-sound between *k*, *g*, and a following *a*-sound has modified the character in words like *cart*, *garden* (*kjart*, *gjarden*), etc. Here belong *cart*, *kind*, *scarlet*, *sky*, *guard*, *guide*, *garrison*, *carriage*, *girl*, etc., (pr. *kjart*, *kjind*, *skjarlet*, *skjæi*, *gjard*, *gjæid*, *gjardn*, *gjarisen*, *kjaredj*, *gjl*, etc.). This change can be traced as far back as the eighteenth century (ELLIS, *idid.* p. 230) and possibly existed even earlier. TRAUTMANN explains this phonetic change thus: "Anstatt der üblichen hintergaumiger *k* und *g* hört man zuweilen, namentlich von älteren leuten, *k* und *g*, also die mit *f* und *j* gleichartigen mittelgaumenklapper.—Was Walker und Smart für eine art von eingescobenem *i* halten, ist das hohe schleifartige nebengeräusch welches die mittelgaumenklapper zu begleiten pflegt, und welches durch das abziehen der mittelzunge vom mittelgaumen entsteht." *Ibid.*, p. 183. PROFESSOR C. F. SMITH in his article in the *Southern Bivouac* for November, 1885, gives this as a peculiarity in Virginia also. It is not confined to Virginia and South Carolina. I have frequently heard it in Boston and Cambridge, Mass., and have no doubt that it is an individual peculiarity all over the country. Here it is the prevailing pronunciation. I have, however, never heard it called a "breaking" before, that expression is only applied to vowels as far as I am aware. This process is called the palatalization of the guttural, and is as old as language itself. The example "geard" is also very unfortunate, as that is not a *g* but the palatal *g* (cf. SIEVERS, p. 61 and 118, and TRAUTMANN, p. 183). The modern *yard* is the reflex of the A.-S. *geard* while *garden*, though belonging to the same root, does not appear until CHAUCER's time, and even then with the hard guttural *g*. *Guide* appears about the same time (CHAUCER) and comes to us through the Romance Languages, though of Teutonic origin; hence it could not have been influenced in any way by the A.-S. *Kind* is A.-S. but did not have this pronunciation at that early date and probably not till the eighteenth century.

The sound of *s* in *assume, consume, ensue, pursuer, suc, suet*, vacillates between *sh, sj, s*. I have heard all three sounds in one or another of these words, *enshu, ensju, or ensu*. *Assjum, con-sjum, etc.*, is the pronunciation of the schools and educated classes, *ashum, etc.*, that of the careless and vulgar, while *asuum, etc.* belongs to the older pronunciation of the latter part of the sixteenth and early part of the seventeenth centuries, having been preserved here, though now seldom heard. This double contagion of developing an *i* before the *u* of such words, and the consequent passage of *s* to *sh*, has not spread to other words like *suicide, suitable, etc.*, as was the tendency in England in the eighteenth century.—The exchange of *v* for *w* in *vocation, provoke, etc.*, has already been noticed under *w*.—The older voiceless sound of *th* in *with* prevails here, *widh* never being heard. In all other cases the *th* and *dh* conform to the general usage throughout the entire land.

The above is by no means intended to be a complete and exhaustive account of all the peculiarities in the pronunciation, as that would imply an extended investigation into all the strata of society and the employment of competent persons to carry it on. I have only given such sounds as I have heard in my daily intercourse with the people without even attempting to exhaust the subject. I must again caution all not to understand the above observations on the peculiarities of Charleston pronunciation as applying to Charleston alone. The peculiar circumstances under which the whole country was settled would exclude any monopoly of sounds by any one place, and the different dialectical peculiarities of England would afford a sufficient variety of sounds, both in the mother country and in America, to make the comparison of the sounds heard in one place with those of another an interesting subject of investigation. Moreover, I have only attempted to treat those sounds based upon the earlier Anglo-Saxon and Romance element found in England after the conquest, leaving out of consideration the French Huguenot and German elements of the population, both of which offer interesting problems for the phonetician. Again the reflex influence of the negro element upon the pronunciation would repay a careful study, and it is to be hoped that some one with a sufficient acquaintance with the Gullah dialect will some day give the world the result of a careful comparison of the mutual influence upon the language and pronunciation of

both whites and blacks.—I have not touched in this paper upon the grammatical part of the language, but have notes of interest which I hope some day to give to the public.

Since writing the above I find by reference to my notes that I have forgotten to mention two varieties of interest. In commenting upon the *i*-sound of the sixteenth century ELLIS remarks (p. 105): "The fine sharp clear (i) is very difficult for an Englishman to pronounce, and although the Scotch can and do pronounce it, they not unfrequently replace it with (*e*) or (e), not (E). In this respect they resemble the Italians who have so frequently replaced Latin *i* by their *e chiuso* or (*e*). The Dutch may be said not to know (i), as they regularly replace it by (*e*). The English sound (*i*) lies between (i) and (*e*). The position of the tongue is the same as for *i*, but the whole of the pharynx and back parts of the mouth are enlarged, making the sound deeper and obscurer." There is a pronunciation of the sound (i) here which corresponds in a measure to that just described by ELLIS. The conjunction *if* is very frequently pronounced (ef), for that is the sound I always hear rather than (ef). I do not remember to have heard this sound in any other word.

Again, the letter *a* has been influenced by the preceding *w* in the one word *was*, so that one hears (wAAz) instead of the ordinary (waas). In the pronunciation of many students the French *oi* therefore, sounds (wAA) and not (wa) ; thus, (wAA), (lwAA), instead of (rwa, lwa).